DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 369 CS 206 074

AUTHOR Diamond, C. T. Patrick
TITLE On a Different Level: Two Pedagogies of Written Expression.
PUB DATE Oct 80
NOTE 17p.: Paper presented at the Annual Fall Conference of the Illinois Association of Teachers of English (Chicago, IL, October 16-18, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Secondary Education; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; *Teaching Styles; *Writing Instruction; *Writing Processes; *Writing Research; Writing Skills

ABSTRACT

Two competing paradigms seem to characterize all models of teaching behavior. The first may be labeled as behavior-analytic, detail specific, and structured in that the learner proceeds through prescribed steps toward each goal. The other may be described as inquiry-oriented and learner-centered in that the learner has greater choice of the means to be employed toward reaching a goal. Teachers who adhere to the first model treat writing reductively, merely as an exercise in the mechanics of spelling, punctuation, and grammar; while those who hold with the opposing model view all writing, no matter how incoherent or incomplete, as attempts to make meaning. They do not see the conventions as a prior condition to writing, but rather as points to be discussed when needed. To determine whether these two models accurately describe teacher attitudes and practices in the classroom, a study was conducted in which 93 teachers sorted 80 cards, each containing a statement about the teaching of writing derived from a search of the literature. The results showed that the teachers used a set of 20 major ideas to think about the teaching of writing--16 of which were related to either the skills-based or to the learner-centered pedagogies. The findings confirm the existence of at least two pedagogies of written expression. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED197369

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"On a Different Level" :

Two Pedagogies of Written Expression

C.T. Patrick Diamond

(Department of Education, University of Queensland)

Presented at the Annual Fall Conference,
Illinois Association of Teachers of English,
Oak Brook, Chicago, October 16 - 18, 1980.

C.T. Patrick Diamond (B.A., B.Ed., M.Ed., Ph.D.) lectures in the Department of Education, University of Queensland. He is the research officer of the Australian Association for the Teaching of English. His interests include: language acquisition and development and teachers' professional perpsectives and their implementability.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C.T. Patrick Diamond

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS206074

INTRODUCTION

Two competing paradigms seem to characterise or underpin all models of teaching behaviour. The first kind of focus can be labelled behaviour-analytic, detail specific and structured, in that the learner proceeds through small, prescribed steps towards each goal. The other kind of model can be described as inquiry-oriented, learner-centered and learner-choice, in that the learner has greater choice of the means to be employed toward reaching the goal. Rosenshine (1976: 340) asserts that these are the two dominant approaches to education: structured, direct instruction and flexible inquiry. These two, and only these two, approaches recur in ancient and modern educational thought so that two pedagogies of written expression are explored in the present study; that is, traditional or skills-based and progressive or growth-oriented.

The Traditional Pedagogy

Cries have continued to go up from sections in the community for a return to the "basics" as when a "Disappointed Distressed Mother" complains:

> At the school my children attend, entertainment appears to have replaced learning. We all wish to possess knowledge but few, comparatively speaking, are willing to pay the price WORK! ("Courier Mail," 8.8.1977)

The next day a rural priest writes:

> Basics are not taught.... Children write essays with no heed to Grammar and make up useless uncreative poetry with neither metre nor rhyme.... The solution for the problem is a return to basics which so many are already crying out for. ("Courier Mail," 9.8.77)

But many teachers may not in fact have abandoned the traditional, didactic model of teaching written language or composition. Burton (1976:5) observes that many teachers of English are themselves in the forefront in keeping the "back to basics" movement alive. No permissive, "soft" or progressive methods for these teachers! Contrary to McAuley's (1976:3)

assertion, there may be no "pop approach using pop materials." Indeed, neither the Bullock Report (1975) nor Bennett et al. (1976:150) could find any evidence of a wholesale move towards informality of teaching methods in British schools. Many teachers would seem to agree that their first task is the transmission to the present generation of bodies of information and of rules collected in the past. They teach as though the educator's main job is the deliberate and direct instruction of such information and rules. They seem to assume that knowledge is acquired independently of the intended uses to which the knowledge is to be put.

This "basics" model treats writing reductively, merely as an exercise in the markable mechanics of spelling, punctuation and grammar. Much of its derived teaching may still be enormously dependent on the process of teaching writing by insistence on the skills, by precept and by intensive correction. Macrorie (1970: 3) has commented that this kind of approach is mainly concerned with the keeping of order and it is not new:

> This way of keeping young persons
> in line, of making sure
> they do not speak in their own voices
> of anything that counts for them,
> goes back to Roman times
> when schoolboys declaimed on
> proper topics in weekly themes. It
> is an ancient tradition,
> one of the principal causes of whining
> boys crawling like snails
> unwilling to school.

As a pedagogy of writing, it is described by Macrorie (1970: 27) as the "First Way": the teacher hands out a package of information and tests to see whether students can remember its contents. The package contains no gifts and the teacher expects none in return. Writing is taught to produce calculated mimicry. This may be done simple because alternative constructions or differing viewpoints have not yet suggested themselves to the teachers. They have not yet been thought of. As William James (1890) writes:

> The mind is at every stage a theatre of simultaneous possibilities. Consciousness consists in the comparison of these with each other, the selection of some, and the suppression of others, of the rest by the reinforcing and inhibiting agency of attention.... All the while the world we feel and (teach) in will be that which our ancestors and we, by slowly cumulative strokes of choice, have extricated out of this, like sculptors, by simply rejecting certain portions of the given stuff. (Cited by Ornstein, 1975: 34)

What many teachers of writing seem to suppress may be described as progressive possibilities. The child is carved in the likeness of error and carelessness, while teaching lives are spent in ignorance of major portions of the other world of learning to write.

An Alternative Pedagogy

This ideology has been variously described as the personal growth model (Dixon, 1967), so that the English curriculum is centered, not on subject matter, but on the child, his interests and needs. According to Mathieson (1975), the growth approach stresses the importance of the individual's emotional life, the likelihood of development through activity and it sees every child, somewhat romantically, as a potential artist.

The ideas of a group of scholars (Piaget, Bruner, Britton and Moffett, for instance) who have been described as the "psycho-rhetoricians" (McPherson: 1977: 186) have greatly influenced this pedagogy. Language is perceived by them as growing directly from human experience and rhetorical definitions are to be made in terms of individual human beings rather than discourse modes. The emphasis is placed on the student and on his use of language so that in the classroom the student is provided with abundant opportunity to use language in all its modes and for all its purposes rather than with mere talk about language. Ideally, using language involves the student in matters close to him. A key figure in setting up the necessary atmosphere of encouragement is the teacher who acts both as a trusted friend and as a responsive audience. In essence, the student is able to talk and write about things that matter to him to someone who matters to him.

Though not adopting a strict nativistic position, the effectiveness of direct, obtrusive teacher intervention may be de-emphasised. Indeed, Piaget (cited by Hunt and Sullivan, 1974: 207) deplores educational efforts to fit students with seven-league boots and to accelerate progression and he refers to them as the "Anglo-Saxon fallacy." Increasingly, many educators are coming to believe that pupils may learn primarily because of their own maturing abilities and because of forces that appear in their backgrounds, homes and community. Stephens (1967: 101) argues that the basic classroom mechanisms to be employed by the teacher are similar to those of the ordinary mother. Successful teaching is not, as commonsense would have it, the deliberate equipping of the pupil by presenting him with what he ought to know and with how he ought to know it.

After discussing the reports of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement in Science, Literature and Reading Comprehension, Britton (1976:4) writes that each of them concludes that,

> in general, the quality of the education which a school produces depends upon the quality of the children who enter the school. In other words the school factor in a child's educational achievement seems to be a relatively insignificant one. It is at least conceivable that school learning will only be effective when it loses itself utterly in an individual's larger (out of school) pattern of learning.

If school is made a very restricted and programmed environment, learning may be reduced rather then enlarged. Customarily, skills-oriented teachers of writing seem to dole out in "carefully" graded spoonfuls how a child is to learn to write: a paragraph on this occasion, a single page narrative on the next and finally a 600 word expository essay. In many classrooms, the complex skill of writing may be analysed into the subconcepts of description, narrative and stream of consciousness and each of these is then taught in rigid sequence.

Chomsky (n.d.: 27-28) rejects such a reductionist and part-task

mode of teaching:

> By diminishing the range and complexity of materials presented to the inquirying mind, by setting behaviour in fixed patterns, these methods may harm and distort the normal development of creative abilities.

Mackay and Simo (1976: 215) agree that the potential with which all healthy children are born is still grossly underestimated and that school environments more often retard than advance children's ability to learn. Perhaps only when students are accepted and provided for as "prodigious learners" can they achieve all that they have in them to become. The mechanism involved is described by Britton (1972: 52) in an insightful constructivist image as the phenomenon of each learner taking what he needs from his language encounters:

> As there is a metabolism of the body, so there must be a metabolism of the mind in learning. A child must draw from the environment (which includes books and teachers) but draw selectively in accordance with the structure of his own personality. In other words, learning has an organic shape. Like a plant or a coral. As teachers we very often think of the shape of learning as though it were frost on the boughs we provide or barnacles on the bottom of our boats.

For successful language learning to occur, more teachers may have to play the role of concerned mother. This material quality of unobtrusiveness characterises good teachers (Rosen and Rosen, 1973: 38) who make it possible for children to pass into the life of primary school with little sense of leaving their own world behind. These teachers help their students without arbitrarily imposing their own intentions on those of their students. A delicate balance is called for here and, as Martin et al. (1976 :162-163) state, it depends upon a teaching-learning relationship which is not one of authority. Its prototype is the mother tracking her child and it is not the teacher examining in order to "spot the errors."

The alternative or growth-centered methodology assumes that all writing, no matter how incoherent or how incomplete, represents an attempt

at making meaning. The conventions are seen not as a prior condition to writing but rather as points to be discussed when needed. There is a shift from criticising the product to co-operating in the process of writing so that teachers help their students first to realise in writing their own individual intentions and only subsequently to attend to the written means that embody them. Emig (1971: 100) concludes.

> The teacher-centered presentation of composition ... is pedagogically, developmentally, and politically an anachronism.

METHOD

The first step in the present study involved the generation of 80 statements about the teaching of writing which the teachers could read and sort. These items were derived, not directly from interviewing teachers, but from the researcher's making a search of the most recent and relevant literature as contained in widely used text and reference books, periodicals and taxonomies of teaching.

The skills-based and the growth-oriented pedagogies of writing were used to guide the sampling of statements. For example, items 26 and 63 correspond to the more traditional viewpoint:

> Learning to write is a conscious, mechanical skill learned in a progressive sequence of techniques for combining words into sentences, sentences into paragraphs and paragraphs into an essay. The teacher dispenses these rules, precepts and principles and the pupils learn by drill. (26)

> The teacher must control the topic to be written about and the way in which it may be written about; she alone must be the audience for whom her pupils write; she must set the length and time limits. All the pupil has to do is perform and then revise the indicated errors. (63)

In contrast, items 5, 35 and 47 exemplify the more progressive construct system:

> As they mature, young people naturally learn to write. (5)

> Our pupils are essentially positive, creative beings and in their writing they can attain to creative insights valuable to themselves and others. (35)

> The chief concern of the English program is to enable the child to use his developing resources of language to explore his personal experiences. (47)

From a pre-test, eighty statements emerged as being unambiguous and not too general. They were then printed on cards (10cm x 8cm) and presented to a volunteer sample of ninety-three teachers of Grade ten English from twenty-two large, state high schools in Brisbane and Ipswich. The sorting session was held with groups of no more than eight teachers at any one time. Each teacher was identified by means of a four digit code number.

After a training task had been completed, each teacher was presented with the deck of eighty different cards. Each card was numbered with the corresponding number on the reverse side. The number was assigned strictly in an alphabetic fashion so that as few clues as possible were given for the classification. It was a free-sort in that the teachers were able to group the stimuli into categories on whatever basis they thought appropriate, apart from agreement or disagreement with the statements.

RESULTS

By applying the statistical operations of latent partition analysis and principal factor analysis (see Diamond, 1979a), the twenty major ideas used by the teachers were identified. They are summarised in Table 1 and have been interpreted and discussed by Diamond (1979b).

TABLE 1: TEACHING WRITING: 20 MAJOR CATEGORIES

No.	Title
1	Teacher-Student Relationship
11	The Mechanical Skills
111	Motivation
1V	Feedback
V	Difficulties in Writing
V1	Developmental Writing Sequence
V11	The Importance of Talk
V111	The Growth Model
1X	The Deductive Teaching of Writing

X	Writing Topics
X1	Natural Development
X11	Sense of Audience
X111	The Ideal Teacher of Writing
X1V	Correctness versus Appropriateness
XV	The Inductive Teaching of Writing
XV1	The Best Writing
XV11	Students' Positive and Creative Nature
XV111	Teacher Domination
X1X	The Futility of Abstractions
XX	Criticisms of Conventional Teaching of Writing

While items 24 and 63 constitute Category XV111 (Teacher Domination), they each have only a very low probability of also being included in Category 1 (Teacher-Student Relationship). These two categories or constructs seem to represent two opposing pedagogies. In contrast. items 77, 80 and 33 have reasonable probabilities of being grouped in either Category V1 (Developmental Writing Sequence) or Category V11 (The Importance of Talk). These ideas seem to reflect the "growth-centered" approach to the teaching of writing. Close inspection of the teachers' sorting behaviour thus suggests that distinctive construct systems relating to the traditional and the progressive pedagogies can be identified. The skills-based repertory seems to consist of Categories 11, 1V, V, 1X, XV1, and XV111; that is, of the Mechanical Skills, Feedback, Difficulties, Deductive Teaching, the Best Writing and Teacher Domination. For example, item 58 which deals with the three basic stages for any writing (pre-plan, write and revise) loads most highly on Category 11 and also moderately on Categories V, 1X and XV1. Items 8 and 26 from Category 11 have probabilities of being included as well in Category V; that is, at the least the mechanical skills and difficulties in writing seem to define a common, deeper pedagogy that could be described as traditional.

There are some items that have exclusive membership either in Category 11 (Skills) or in Category V111 (Growth) and others either in Category XV111 (Teacher Domination) or in Category 1 (Teacher-Student

Relationship). Categories 1, 111, V1, V11, V111, X1, X111, XV, XV, XV11 and XX associate to suggest the more progressive pedagogy. It consists of Teacher-Student Relationship, Motivation, Developmental Sequence, the Importance of Talk, the Growth Model, Natural Development, the Ideal Teacher of Writing, Inductive Teaching, Students' Positive Nature and Criticisms of Conventional Teaching of Writing. As the discussion of Categories XV and XV11 shows, some items are shared, to a degree, by Categories V111 and XV11 and by Categories X1 and XV respectively; that is, the growth model is defined by the positive nature of students, the natural development of writing and by inductive teaching. These latter elements closely resemble what are described by Mathieson (1975: 57) as "progressive" components. Such a growth-oriented perspective draws, however implicitly, upon the work of Piaget, Bruner, Moffett and Britton. It is concerned with subjective experience and with its composition in the individual who creates his own objects.

DISCUSSION

The present study has shown that the sample of ninety-three teachers used a set of twenty major ideas to think about the teaching of writing. Sixteen of the constructs related either to the skills-based or to the growth-oriented pedagogies. After Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel (1976) intensively interviewed sixty American elementary teachers who were attempting to follow more informal approaches to instruction, they were found by a thematic analysis to hold what were described as seventeen "priorities" and eleven of these had a cognitive or skills-based emphasis and six a more personal orientation.

In the present study, the grouped items or categories can be taken as corresponding to the teachers' commonsense knowledge about the teaching of writing; however, only a proportion of the sample shared any one

particular category. Although these similarities exist among the teachers' constructs regarding the teaching of writing, none of the categories had a probability greater than .58 of being formed. Since most are around .40, it has to be acknowledged that there was considerable disagreement as well as some consensus; that is, not all of the teachers used every construct to define their teaching. It is evident that groups of teachers with distinctive personal construct systems reside in the sample. By statistically contrasting the pairing of items made by the teachers (Diamond, 1979a) it is possible to show that different sectors of this occupational group employ distinctive subsystems or even competing paradigms.

A number of other studies empirically confirm the existence of the two underlying pedagogies. Kerlinger (1958, 1967) has shown that two relatively orthogonal factors, "traditionalism" and"progressivism," seem to underlie teachers' attitudes towards education. Sontag (1968) uses an eighty item Q-sort rather than a questionnaire in order to measure eighty American elementary and high school teachers' perceptions of desirable teacher behaviours. The items are concise statements that reflect teachers' classroom behaviours in the areas previously used by Kerlinger. The high school teachers' sort yields four factors: general subject matter, concern for students, structure and subject matter, and norms and rules. Most of the teachers rated as traditionalists load on the first factor and the progressives on the second.

Barnes and Shemilt (1974) have looked at the ways British teachers differ in their tacit assumptions about the teaching of writing. One hundred and twenty-five teachers from eleven secondary schools completed four sentences such as: "When I set written work I do so primarily...." or "When I mark written work I ...." The questions are deliberately vague so that, in atrributing meaning to them, the respondents are compelled to use their own covert assumptions about teaching writing. After coding the

replies, the dimension called "Transmission-Interpretation" was obtained statistically.

According to Barnes and Shemilt (1974: 220-227), the Interpretation teacher sees writing as a means by which the pupil can reshape his world-view. She tries to ensure that her students see the writing as relevant to their own purposes and see writing as contributing to a dialogue in which they play a crucial part. She therefore gives her pupils' writing the status of wider publication, allowing it to influence the direction of lessons. On the other hand, the Transmission teacher is primarily aware of writing as a means of measuring the pupils' performance against her own expectations and criteria. When setting written work, she focuses upon the kind of writing she wants, assuming it is her business to define their task and then to provide them with feedback, indicating their success in measuring up to her standards. The writing is to be addressed to a general, disembodied reader rather than to her or themselves. Finally, she believes her main reponsibility is to indicate errors and award grades.

Ashton et al. (1975) have found among 1,513 British primary teachers a great deal of consensus or commonality, as well as two distinctive sub-groups: the traditionalists and the progressives. However, overall the teachers are very alike in giving high priority both to the skills of reading, writing, oracy and numeracy and to bringing up children as acceptable members of society. In their study of the effects of teaching style on British, primary school pupils' progress, personality and behaviour, Bennett et al. (1976) have derived a formal-informal typology which also includes a mixed group of teachers.

In the present study when fifteen teachers who had demonstrably representative perspectives on the teaching of writing (see Diamond, 1979a) were interviewed, they agreed that the two pedagogies accorded with their experience. Teachers 1901, 1906 and 2201 confirmed that there are teachers

who "teach the skills and nothing else," while there are "just a few teachers for growth." Teachers 2201 and 0705 comment that "how you relate to kids" is central to the more "tender-minded" pedagogy. However, they also believe that some combination or mixture of both paradigms occurs, as do teachers 1905 and 1906 in the following extract:

> Teacher 1906: Most teachers are a bit of both. I think I'd probably come in there too.
>
> Teacher 1901: Me too.
>
> Teacher 1906: You realise perhaps there's another way so you integrate your approach.
>
> Teacher 1901: You try to balance the two.

Such a mixed point of view may be eclectic and balanced or it may be inconsistent and confused. If the skills-based and the growth-oriented pedagogies can be considered as paradigms, Kuhn (1970, 1978) insists that a balance cannot be struck and that there is an "essential tension" between them. Teacher 2201 also describes the mixed pedagogical perspective as inherently confused and even punitive:

> A lot of teachers just don't know where they're going. They're not balanced so much as truculent and obstinate. They're bored because they dislike kids. They have a kind of Nazi self-hate and believe that teaching and learning are hard and offer no gratification. They're set in a mould and need a total rethink.

Kelly (1955) has described such a state of perception as representing a "hardening of the categories."

If the growth-related construct system is taken as the tradition-shattering complement to the tradition-bound, "normal," skills-based ideas about the teaching of writing, a paradigm shift or revolution may be occurring in English teaching as the time-honoured theory is rejected in favour of another antagonistic both to it and to the imagination of many of the specialists in whose domain the clash is occurring. Teacher 0705 captures something of the strain of change for them:

> Trust -- I wouldn't call it that. You just can't afford to get too close to the kids even if you wanted to. They'll break you end from end.

The usual developmental pattern of growth in thought is presumably the successive transition from one paradigm to another through the "scales falling from the eyes" but the process of illumination is far from cumulative. The "gestalt switch" is not achieved by an articulation or extension of the old paradigm to form the basis of a new eclectic or balanced state. Rather it is a total reconstruction of the field from new fundamentals. Such a process of re-orientation involves handling the same bundle of data as before but placing them in a fresh system of relations with one another and giving them the different framework by using the unfamiliar major construct. An unprecedented way of seeing is involved as two of the centroid teachers indicate:

Teacher 1901: The skills teachers say all you have to do is just teach them to read and write. They collect their pay, they work from 9 to 3 and that's it.

Teacher 1906: Yes, they never do any work at home. I envy them that it's just so easy.

Teacher 1901: But they don't enjoy teaching. It really has to do with a whole new kind of awareness. They have no concept of what we're about. It's on a different level.

CONCLUSION

The present study has confirmed and discussed the existence of at least two pedagogies of written expression: skills-based or traditional and growth oriented or progressive. However, it may be one thing to form and then to interrelate such constructs or ideas but quite another actually to implement them in the classroom by means of appropriate teaching strategies. It may be yet another for these teaching enactments to have the hoped for affects on the eventual writing performance of pupils. Each stage involved in the teaching process may be on quite "a different level" as is each of the contrasting pedagogies.

REFERENCES

ASHTON, P., et al., 1975; The Aims of Primary Education: A Study of Teachers' Opinions. London: Macmillan.

BARNES, D., & SHEMILT, D., 1974; Transmission and Interpretation. Educational Review, 26, 3, 213-228.

BENNETT, N. et al., 1976; Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress. London: Open Books.

BRITTON, J., 1972; Writing to Learn and Learning to Write. In The Humanity of English. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

BRITTON, J., 1976; Language out of school. English in Australia, 35, 3-15.

BULLOCK REPORT, 1975; A Language for Life. London: HMSO.

BURTON, D.L., 1976; Relax with back-to-basics. English Journal, 65, 8, 5-6.

BUSSIS, A.M., CHITTENDEN, E.A., & AMAREL, M., 1976; Beyond Surface Curriculum. Boulder: Westview Press.

CHOMSKY, N., n.d.; Form and Meaning in Natural Language. Amsterdam.

DIAMOND, C.T.P., 1979a; The Constructs, Classroom Practices and Effectiveness of Grade Ten Teachers of Written Expression, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Queensland.

DIAMOND, C.T.P., 1979b; The skills or growth: English teachers' thinking about the teaching of writing. English in Australia, 48, 57-66.

DIXON, J., 1967; Growth through English. London: National Association of Teachers of English.

EMIG, J., 1971; The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders. Urbana, Illinois: Research Report No. 13, National Council of Teachers of English.

HUNT, D.E., & SULLIVAN, E.V., 1974; Between Psychology and Education. Hinsdale: Dryden Press.

KELLY, G.A., 1955; The Psychology of Personal Constructs. New York: Norton.

KERLINGER, F.N., 1958; Progressivism and traditionalism: Basic factors of education attitudes. Journal of Social Psychology, 48, 111-135.

KERLINGER, F.N., 1967; The first and second-order factor structures of attitudes toward education. American Educational Research Journal, 4, 3, 191-205.

KUHN, T.S., 1970; The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

KUHN, T.S., 1978; The Essential Tension. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

MACKAY, D., & SIMO, J., 1976; Help Your Child to Read and Write, and More. Hardmondsworth: Penguin.

MACRORIE, K., 1970; Uptaught. New York: Hayden.

McAULEY, J., 1976; Levels of literacy: A perspective. Language in Focus. Canberra: Newsletter No. 2, National Committee on English Teaching, 3.

McPHERSON, E., 1977; Composition. In Squire, J.R. (Ed.), The Teaching of English. Seventy-Sixth Yearbook, Part I. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

MARTIN, N., D'ARCY, P., NEWTON, B., & PARKER, R., 1976; Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum 11-16. London: Ward Lock.

MATHIESON, M., 1975; The Preachers of Culture. London: Allen and Unwin.

MOFFETT, J., 1968; Teaching the Universe of Discourse. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

ORNSTEIN, R.E., 1975; The Psychology of Consciousness. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

ROSEN, C., & ROSEN, H., 1973; The Language of Primary School Children. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

ROSENSHINE, B., 1976; Classroom Instruction. In Gage, N.L. (Ed.), The Psychology of Teaching Methods. Seventy-Fifth Yearbook, Part I. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press.

SONTAG, M., 1968; Attitudes toward education and perception of teacher behaviors. American Educational Research Journal, 5, 3, 385-401.

STEPHENS, J.M., 1967; The Process of Schooling. New York: Holt.